### CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

ORDER NO. R5-2002-0133

NPDES NO. CA0084891

# WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BOEING COMPANY INTERIM GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM INACTIVE RANCHO CORDOVA TEST SITE SACRAMENTO COUNTY

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (hereafter Board) finds that:

- 1. The Boeing Company (hereafter Discharger) submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 14 December 2001 and supplemental information dated 23 May 2002, and applied for authorization to discharge waste under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) from the Interim Groundwater Treatment System for the Inactive Rancho Cordova Test Site (IRCTS).
- 2. The Discharger operated a rocket-testing facility in eastern Sacramento County near Rancho Cordova and Folsom. The facility is on property known as the IRCTS and is currently owned by the Aerojet-General Corporation (Aerojet). The Discharger, along with Aerojet, performed practices that have caused the release of pollutants into the vadose zone and groundwater at the IRCTS. The main pollutants of concern at the IRCTS are perchlorate, a component of solid rocket propellant, and volatile organic contaminants (VOCs) such as trichloroethylene (TCE) used in the cleaning of equipment.
- 3. A plume of perchlorate in groundwater has migrated from the IRCTS to the west underneath Mather Field. This plume of perchlorate creates or threatens to create a condition of pollution or nuisance. In response, the Board issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 97-093 to the Discharger and Aerojet requiring the investigation of the extent of perchlorate in groundwater emanating from the IRCTS and the development of an interim remedial measure to contain the perchlorate plume.
- 4. To comply with the Cleanup and Abatement Order, the Discharger submitted a plan proposing to extract groundwater from approximately five locations on Mather Field and pipe the water to a central treatment plant for treatment and discharge. Negotiations with Sacramento County, the current leaseholder for Mather Field property where the extraction wells and treatment system are proposed, have been protracted. The delay in reaching agreement over a permanent treatment system has led to the development of a temporary treatment system using ion exchange to treat water from an extraction well at the head of the perchlorate plume, with

-2-

discharge of the treated water to an on-site drainage system discharging to Morrison Creek. The temporary system will be utilized until the long-term treatment system is operational, which is estimated to be within two years. See Attachment A, a part of this Order.

- 5. The interim groundwater treatment system will consist of one or more extraction wells.
- 6. The treatment system and discharge are in Section 24, T8N, R5E, MDB&M. The discharge from the IRCTS system is to a drainage ditch on Mather Field, tributary to Morrison Creek, at Latitude N38° 34 7.5″, Longitude W121° 18′ 8.2. Morrison Creek discharges into Stone Lake over 15 miles downstream from the Mather Field, and eventually to the Sacramento River. See Attachments A and B, incorporated herein and made part of this Order.
- 7. The Report of Waste Discharge for the IRCTS facility, including data from sampling nearby groundwater wells, describes the discharge as follows:

Monthly Average Flow: 1.44 mgd
Daily Peak Flow: 2.16 mgd
Design Flow: 2.16 mgd

Average Temperature: 67°F summer; 67°F winter

pH 6-9

Constituent	<u>mg/l</u>
COD	<10
Total Suspended Solids	<10
Chlorides	3.0
Sulfate	3.4
Manganese	< 0.02
Aluminum	< 0.050
Zinc	0.011
Arsenic	0.001
Lead	0.004
Hardness (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	55
Barium	0.037
Copper	0.023
Chromium	0.013
Nickel	0.015
All Volatile Organic Contaminants	< 0.0005
Perchlorate	< 0.004
Total Dissolved Solids	57

- 8. The plume of pollutants in groundwater also contains low concentration of trichloroethylene (TCE) a considerable distance upgradient of the proposed extraction well. It is unlikely that TCE will be found in the influent to the treatment plant. However, if TCE is detected at greater than 0.0005 mg/l following the process provided in Provision E.9, below, a treatment system will be added to remove TCE to below 0.0005 mg/l (MCL of 0.005 mg/l). The interim effluent limit for TCE is set at 0.0008 mg/l. Once TCE treatment is constructed and operational, the effluent limit for TCE is 0.0005 mg/l.
- 9. The ion exchange perchlorate treatment system has been demonstrated to be able to remove perchlorate to below 0.004 mg/l, the current California Department of Health Services Action Level for perchlorate. The effluent limitation is established at that concentration.
- 10. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Board have classified this discharge as a minor discharge.
- 11. USEPA adopted the *National Toxics Rule* (NTR) on 5 February 1993 and the *California Toxics Rule* (CTR) on 18 May 2000. These Rules contain water quality standards applicable to this discharge. The State Water Resources Control Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (known as the State Implementation Plan), which contains guidance on implementation of the *National Toxics Rule* and the *California Toxics Rule*.
- 12. The Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition, for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (hereafter Basin Plan). The Basin Plan designates the beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve water quality objectives for all waters of the Basin. These requirements implement the Basin Plan.
- 13. The Basin Plan adopted by the Board includes a Wastewater Reuse Policy that encourages the reclamation and reuse of wastewater, including treated groundwater resulting from a cleanup action, where practicable. Those reuse options include municipal and industrial supply, crop irrigation, groundwater recharge, and wetland restoration. At this time demonstrated cost-effective options that provided for reuse of the treated groundwater have not been identified. However, given the existing groundwater contamination affecting current and future groundwater supplies, the highest priority for this treated groundwater is the replacement of lost water supplies, unless other sources are readily available. Several other potential reuse options that could prove applicable in the future should also be evaluated. The Discharger is required in Provision No. 8 to evaluate reuse options and develop a report to the Executive Officer regarding the evaluation.

-4-

- 14. The project has a potential effect on the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin from which the IRCTS extraction field takes its water. The Regional Board has addressed this potential effect by evaluating alternatives to allowing the proposed discharge. No feasible alternative to the proposed project exists at this time. Neither reuse nor recharge of the treated groundwater is feasible at this time. Neither direct nor indirect reuse is feasible at this time and the Regional Board does not have the authority to direct the manner of compliance (e.g., to direct recharge or reuse of the treated groundwater). The alternative of not allowing the proposed discharge to surface waters exists but poses serious environmental consequences because it would impede the cleanup of the groundwater. Pursuant to California Water Code Sections 13267 and 13383, Provisions 8 and 9 require the Discharger to submit technical reports evaluating whether there are impacts on the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin caused by the permitted activity and evaluating potential direct and indirect reuse options for the discharged water. The required evaluations will allow the Regional Board to determine whether there are additional environmental impacts of the Discharger's pumping and will encourage the reuse of treated groundwater consistent with the Wastewater Reuse Policy set forth in the Basin Plan.
- 15. Federal regulations require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an instream excursion above a narrative or numeric water quality standard. Based on information submitted as part of the application and from past monitoring, the Board finds that the proposed discharge has a reasonable potential to exceed standards and objectives for the constituents discussed in the Information Sheet for the following constituents:
  - a. VOCs: trichloroethene; and an effluent limitation has been included in this Order. The treatment system will be modified to include TCE treatment to meet the effluent limit, if removal of TCE is required as determined by Provision 9. There are many standard treatment methods that are shown capable of meeting the effluent limitations if removal of trichloroethene is required.
  - b. Non-VOCs: perchlorate; and effluent limitations for this constituent has been included in this Order.
  - c. This Order and the Basin Plan prohibit the discharge of toxic constituents in toxic amounts. Based on information submitted as part of the application and monitoring reports, trichloroethene and perchlorate have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to a violation of the Basin Plan narrative prohibition of the discharge of toxic substances in toxic concentrations. The Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California; Rule (California Toxics Rule) is promulgated in the Federal Register, 40CFR Part 131, Part III. Effluent limitations for trichloroethene, based on the California Toxics Rule and Best Available Technology (as

-5-

described above), are included in this Order.

- 16. Federal regulations require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an instream excursion above a narrative or numerical water quality objective. This Order contains provisions that:
  - a. require the Discharger to provide information as to whether the levels of priority pollutants, including CTR and NTR constituents, and constituents for which drinking water maximum contaminant levels (MCL) are prescribed in the California Code of Regulations, and temperature in the discharge cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality objective;
  - b. if the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality objective, require the Discharger to submit information necessary to calculate effluent limitations for those constituents; and
  - c. allow the Board to reopen this Order and include effluent limitations for those constituents.
- 17. The beneficial uses of the Sacramento River downstream of the discharge are municipal and domestic, industrial, and agricultural supply; water contact and noncontact recreation; groundwater recharge, fresh water replenishment; and preservation and enhancement of fish, wildlife and other aquatic resources.
- 18. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are municipal and domestic, industrial, and agricultural supply.
- 19. There is not a sufficient amount of information to determine if copper and lead have a reasonable potential to cause an exceendance of criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Sampling of groundwater has shown a large range in concentrations of these metals, from non-detect to  $23 \,\mu\text{g/l}$ , and hardness has ranged from 50 mg/l to over 600 mg/l. Additional samples will be collected to determine the concentrations of these metals and hardness, and this permit may be reopened to establish limits, if needed, under Effluent Limitation B.1. (See Provision E.1).
- 20. The permitted discharge will allows some degradation of water quality but is consistent with federal antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 68-16 (Antidegradation Policy) because the permitted discharge is required to result in best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that

-6-

- pollution or nuisance will not occur and will maintain the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit of the people of the state.
- 21. Effluent limitations, and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to Sections 301, 302, 304, and 307 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.
- 22. The action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21100, et seq.), requiring preparation of an environmental impact report or negative declaration, in accordance with Section 13389 of the California Water Code.
- 23. The Department of Toxic Substances Control has certified a final Negative Declaration and Initial Study in accordance with the CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines. The Board has reviewed the Negative Declaration and these waste discharge requirements will mitigate or avoid any significant impacts on water quality.
- 24. The Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity for a public hearing and an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.
- 25. The Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge.
- 26. This Order shall serve as an NPDES permit pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA, and amendments thereto, and shall take effect upon the date of hearing, provided EPA has no objections.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that The Boeing Company, its agents, successors and assigns, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

#### A. Discharge Prohibitions:

1. Discharge of treated wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in Finding No. 6 is prohibited.

## WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS ORDER NO. R5-2002-0133 THE BOEING COMPANY INTERIM GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM INACTIVE RANCHO CORDOVA TEST SITE SACRAMENTO COUNTY

-7-

- 2. The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by the attached Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements A.13.
- 3. The discharge shall not cause the degradation of any water supply.
- 4. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.

#### **B.** Effluent Limitations:

1. Effluent from the treatment facility shall not exceed the following limits:

Constituents	<u>Units</u>	Daily <u>Maximum</u>	Monthly Average
Volatile Organics <sup>1,2</sup> Perchlorate	μg/l μg/l	$0.5^{1}$	4

All volatile organic constituents listed in EPA Methods 8010 and 8020. The concentration of each constituent shall not exceed 0.5 μg/l.

- 3. The discharge shall not have a pH less than 6.5 nor greater than 8.5.
- 4. The 30-day average daily discharge flow shall not exceed 2.16 mgd.
- 5. Survival of aquatic organism in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

Minimum for any one bioassay - - - - - - 70% Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays - - - - 90%

#### C. Sludge Disposal:

1. Collected screenings, sludges, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner that is consistent with Chapter 15, Division 3, Title 23, of the CCR and approved by the Executive Officer.

The effluent limit for trichloroethene shall be 0.8 until its removal is required. Once removal is required, the effluent limit shall be 0.5 µg/l. See Provision 10.

## WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS ORDER NO. R5-2002-0133 THE BOEING COMPANY INTERIM GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM INACTIVE RANCHO CORDOVA TEST SITE SACRAMENTO COUNTY

-8-

2. Any proposed change in sludge use or disposal practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and EPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.

#### **D.** Receiving Water Limitations:

Receiving Water Limitations are site-specific interpretations of water quality objectives from applicable water quality control plans. As such they are a required part of this permit. However, a receiving water condition not in conformance with the limitation is not necessarily a violation of this Order. The Board may require an investigation to determine the cause and culpability prior to asserting that a violation has occurred.

The discharge shall not cause the following in the receiving water:

- 1. Concentrations of dissolved oxygen to fall below 7.0 mg/l.
- 2. Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to form a visible film or coating on the water surface or on the stream bottom.
- 3. Oils, greases, waxes, floating material (liquids, solids, foams, and scums) or suspended material to create a nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 4. Aesthetically undesirable discoloration.
- 5. Fungi, slimes, or other objectionable growths.
- 6. Turbidity to increase more than 20 percent over background levels.
- 7. The normal ambient pH to fall below 6.5, exceed 8.5.
- 8. Deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
- 9. The normal ambient temperature to be increased more than 5°F.
- 10. Taste or odor-producing substances to impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin or to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 11. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that exceed maximum contaminant levels specified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22; that harm human, plant, animal or aquatic life; or that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.

-9-

- 12. Aquatic communities and populations, including vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species, to be degraded.
- 13. Toxic pollutants to be present in the water column, sediments, or biota in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; that produce detrimental response in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life; or that bioaccumulate in aquatic resources at levels which are harmful to human health.
- 14. Violation of any applicable water quality standard for receiving waters adopted by the Board or the State Water Resources Control Board pursuant to the CWA and regulations adopted thereunder.

#### E. Provisions:

- 1. By **1 September 2002**, the Discharger shall submit a plan and time schedule for the evaluation of hardness, and total copper and lead concentrations, in the groundwater captured by the extraction well, the effluent from the treatment system, and Morrison Creek upstream and downstream of the discharge point. The plan should provide for the gathering of sufficient information to allow appropriate establishment of effluent limitations for copper and lead. A report on the completed study shall be submitted no later than **1 April 2003**. The Discharger shall implement the plan upon approval of the Executive Officer. The permit may be reopened, if necessary, to include effluent limitations for copper and lead.
- 2. The Discharger shall submit an Operation, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan for the Ground Water Extraction and Treatment System by **1 November 2002**. The Discharger shall operate the treatment system according to the plan.
- Reporting Program. If the testing indicates that the discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above the water quality objective for toxicity, the Discharge shall submit a work plan to conduct a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) and upon approval conduct the TRE, and this Order will be reopened and a chronic toxicity limitation included and/or a limitation for the specific toxicant identified in the TRE included. Additionally, if a chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, this Order may be reopened and a limitation based on that objective included.
- 4. The Discharger shall use the best practicable cost-effective control technique currently available to limit mineralization to no more than a reasonable increment.

-10-

- 5. The Discharger shall comply with all the items of the "Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements for Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES)", dated 1 March 1991, which are part of this Order. This attachment and its individual paragraphs are referred to as "Standard Provision(s)."
- 6. The Discharger shall comply with the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2002-0133 which is part of this Order, and any revisions thereto, as ordered by the Executive Officer.
- 7. Under Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2002-0133, the Discharger shall report trace concentrations of constituents found during the analysis of samples. Trace values are estimates of concentrations detected between the detection level and the practical quantitation level. Trace values are not always reliable as there is a potential for interferences below the practical quantitation level. As effluent limitations specified in this permit are at or above the practical quantitation level, reporting trace values shall not be a violation of an effluent limitation. Trace values are to be used to help operate the treatment facility and to provide information to minimize violations of effluent limits.
- 8. By 1 October 2002 the Discharger shall submit a time schedule for planning, developing, and submitting a technical report that evaluates the direct and indirect reuse of the treated groundwater from the groundwater extraction and treatment systems allowed to discharge under this permit and that makes appropriate recommendations for reuse of the water, including but not limited to, as municipal and industrial supply, crop irrigation, groundwater recharge, landscape irrigation, and wetland restoration. The Discharger shall submit the report by 1 August 2003. The Discharger should prepare the report in coordination with the Department of Health Services and local water purveyors, including, but not necessarily limited to Sacramento County Water Agency, California-American Water Company, and American States Water Company. This permit may be reopened to reflect changes in the discharge, as appropriate.
- 9. By 1 October 2002 the Discharger shall submit a time schedule for planning, developing, and submitting a technical report that assesses the cumulative impacts on the groundwater basin caused by the withdrawal and export of the groundwater from the GET systems that discharge to surface water under this permit and that evaluates alternatives for addressing significant impacts identified, if any. The Discharger shall submit the report by 1 August 2003. The Discharger should prepare its report in coordination with the Water Forum, the local water purveyors including, but not necessarily limited to Sacramento County Water Agency, California-American Water Company, and Southern California Water Company, and other responsible parties, other than the Discharger, extracting groundwater to remediate groundwater pollution. The Discharger shall proceed with the preparation of the report in accordance with the schedule upon approval of the Executive Officer.

- 10. If the Discharger confirms the presence of trichloroethene, or other VOCs, greater than 0.5 μg/l in the influent to the treatment system, then the Discharger shall provide treatment for removal of trichloroethene or VOCs to concentrations to less than 0.5 μg/l. Confirmation shall consist of six samples collected over a three-week period. If at least half the samples contain concentrations exceeding 0.5 μg/l, then the presence shall be confirmed for this provision to be greater than 0.5 μg/l and trigger the requirement for adding treatment. Within **30-days of confirmation**, the Discharger shall provide the Executive Officer with a schedule for constructing and operating appropriate treatment equipment to remove VOCs. The Discharger shall implement the construction upon approval by the Executive Officer.
- 11. This Order expires on **1 July 2007** and the Discharger must file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with Title 23, CCR, not later than 180 days in advance of such date in application for renewal of waste discharge requirements if it wishes to continue the discharge.
- 12. Prior to making any change in the discharge point, place of use, or purpose of use of the wastewater, the Discharger shall obtain approval of or clearance from the State Water Resources Control Board (Division of Water Rights).
- 13. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to this office.

To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the State of incorporation if a corporation, the name, address, and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Board, and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory paragraph of Standard Provision D.6 and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

I, THOMAS R. PINKOS, Acting Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on 19 July 2002.

-12-

THOMAS R. PINKOS, Acting Executive Officer

Revised 07/19/02:AMM

-13-

### CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

#### MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

NPDES NO. CA

ORDER NO. R5-2002-0133

# FOR THE BOEING COMPANY INTERIM GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM INACTIVE RANCHO CORDOVA TEST SITE SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Specific sample station locations have been established under direction of the Board's staff, and a description of the stations is attached to this Order.

#### GROUNDWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM MONITORING

Samples shall be collected from the inlet and outlet to the treatment system and analyzed. If the discharge is intermittent rather than continuous, then the samples shall be collected on the first day of the intermittent discharge. The time of collection of samples shall be recorded. The treatment system monitoring shall include at least the following:

Constituents	Units	Type of Sample	Inlet or Outlet	Sampling Frequency
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/l	Grab	Outlet	Monthly
Flow <sup>1</sup>	mgd	Grab	Outlet	Monthly
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/l	Grab	Outlet	Monthly
Acute Toxicity <sup>2,3</sup>		Grab	Outlet	Monthly
Volatile Organics <sup>4</sup>	μg/l	Grab	Inlet and Outlet	Monthly
$pH^1$	Number	Grab	Outlet	Monthly
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	Outlet	Monthly
Temperature <sup>1</sup>	°F (°C)	Grab	Outlet	Weekly
Electrical Conductivity@25°C	μmhos/cm	Grab	Outlet	Monthly
Total Copper	mg/l	Grab	Outlet	Quarterly

Constituents	Units	Type of Sample	Inlet or Outlet	Sampling Frequency
Total Lead	mg/l	Grab	Outlet	Quarterly
Perchlorate <sup>5</sup>	μg/l	Grab	Inlet and Outlet	Monthly
Hardness as (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/l	Grab	Outlet	Monthly

#### Footnotes on next page.

Field Measurements.

The analyses shall be performed in accordance with EPA/600/4-90/027, Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms.

Sampling of Effluent only.

Test method to be by EPA Methods 601 and 602, or 8010 and 8020, or 8260, or 500 series with a practical quantitation level no greater than 0.5 µg/l. All concentrations between the detection level and practical quantitation level shall be reported as trace.

A practical quantitation level of 4 µg/l. All concentrations between the detection level and quantitation level shall be

reported as trace.

Note: All metals analyses shall be by atomic adsorption methods or a method with an equivalent practical quantitation limit. In addition, chronic toxicity monitoring for the treatment system is also required, and detailed below.

#### RECEIVING WATER MONITORING

All receiving water samples shall be grab samples. Receiving water monitoring shall include at least the following:

<u>Station</u>	<u>Description</u>
R-1	At least 100 feet upstream on Morrison Creek from the confluence with drainage ditch discharge.
R-2	At least 50-feet downstream on Morrison Creek from the confluence with the drainage ditch discharge.

Constituents	Units	Station	Sampling Frequency
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/l	R-1, R-2	Monthly
Electrical Conductivity@25°C	μmhos/cm	R-1, R-2	Monthly
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/l	R-1, R-2	Monthly
Volatile Organics <sup>1</sup>	μg/l	R-1, R-2	Monthly
рН	Number	R-1, R-2	Monthly
Turbidity	NTU	R-1, R-2	Monthly
Temperature	°F (°C)	R-1, R-2	Monthly

Constituents	Units	Station	Sampling Frequency
Total Copper	mg/l	R-1, R-2	Quarterly
Total Lead	mg/l	R-1, R-2	Quarterly
Perchlorate <sup>2</sup>	μg/l	R-1, R-2	Monthly
Hardness as (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/l	R-1, R-2	Monthly

#### Footnotes on next page.

Test method to be by EPA Methods 601 and 602, or 8010 and 8020, or 8260, or 500 series with a practical quantitation level no greater than  $0.5 \,\mu\text{g/l}$ . All concentrations between the detection level and practical quantitation level shall be reported as trace.

A practical quantitation level of 4 μg/l. All concentrations between the detection level and quantitation level shall be reported as trace.

Note: All metals analyses shall be by atomic adsorption methods.

In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions in the Morrison Creek. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:

a. Floating or suspended matter

e. Visible films, sheens or coatings

b. Discoloration

f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths

c. Bottom deposits

g. Potential nuisance conditions

d. Aquatic life

Notes on receiving water conditions shall be summarized in the monitoring report.

#### THREE SPECIES CHRONIC TOXICITY MONITORING

Chronic toxicity monitoring shall be conducted to determine whether the effluent is contributing to toxicity in Morrison Creek. The testing shall be conducted as specified in EPA 600/4-89-001. Chronic toxicity samples shall be collected at the discharge of the Ground Water Treatment Plant prior to entering the drainage ditch. Samples collected from the outlet of the treatment unit shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The time of collection for samples shall be recorded. Chronic toxicity monitoring shall include the following:

Species: Pimephales promelas, Ceriodaphnia dubia, Selenastrum

capriocornutum

Frequency: Once per quarter for first year, annually

thereafter

Dilution Series: 100 percent effluent

#### REPORTING

Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Regional Board by the **25th day of the month** following sample collection. Quarterly and annual monitoring results shall be submitted by the **25th day of the month** following each calendar quarter and year, respectively.

In reporting the monitoring data, the Discharger shall arrange the data in tabular form so that the date, the constituents, and the concentrations are readily discernible. The data shall be summarized in such a manner to illustrate clearly whether the discharge complies with waste discharge requirements.

If the Discharger monitors any pollutant at the locations designated herein more frequently than is required by this Order, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the values required in the discharge monitoring report form. Such increased frequency shall be indicated on the discharge monitoring report form.

By **30 January of each year**, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing the following:

- a. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the plant for emergency and routine situations.
- b. A statement certifying when the flow meter and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration (Standard Provision C.6).

The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing. The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the waste discharge requirements.

All reports submitted in response to this Order shall comply with the signatory requirements of Standard Provision D.6.

The Discharger shall implement the above monitoring program on the first day of the month following effective date of this Order.

Ordered by:_	
-	THOMAS R. PINKOS, Acting Executive Officer
	19 July 2002

-17-

(Date)

AMM (6/5/02)

#### INFORMATION SHEET

ORDER NO. R5-2002-0133
THE BOEING COMPANY
INTERIM GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM
INACTIVE RANCHO CORDOVA TEST SITE
SACRAMENTO COUNTY

#### **Background**

The Boeing Company operated a rocket-testing facility in eastern Sacramento County near Rancho Cordova and Folsom. The facility is on property known as the IRCTS, is currently owned by the Aerojet-General Corporation (Aerojet). The Discharger, along with the Aerojet, performed practices that have caused the release of pollutants into the vadose zone and groundwater at the IRCTS. The main pollutants of concern at the IRCTS are perchlorate, a component of solid rocket propellant, and volatile organic contaminants (VOCs) such as trichloroethylene (TCE) used in the cleaning of equipment.

A plume of perchlorate in groundwater has migrated from the IRCTS to the west underneath Mather Field. This plume of perchlorate creates or threatens to create a condition of pollution or nuisance. In response, the Board issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 97-093 to the Boeing Company and Aerojet requiring the investigation of the extent of perchlorate in groundwater emanating from the IRCTS and the development of a interim remedial measure to contain the perchlorate plume.

To comply with the Cleanup and Abatement Order, the Boeing Company and Aeroejt submitted a plan proposing to extract groundwater from approximately five locations on Mather Field and pipe the water to a central treatment plant for treatment and discharge. Negotiations with Sacramento County, the current landowner where the extraction wells and treatment system are proposed, have been protracted. The delay in reaching agreement over a permanent treatment system has led to the development of a temporary treatment system using ion exchange to treat water from an extraction well at the head of the perchlorate plume, with discharge of the treated water to an on-site drainage system discharging to Morrison Creek. The temporary system will be utilized until the long-term treatment system is operational, which is estimated to be within two years.

The interim groundwater treatment system will consist of one or more extraction wells extracting groundwater on the northwestern side of Mather Field. The groundwater will be piped to an above ground treatment system that will use a treatment system utilizing and ion-exchange process to remove perchlorate to less than 4 micrograms per liter ( $\mu$ g/l). The treated groundwater is then discharge to a southward flowing drainage ditch which discharges to Morrison Creek. Morrison Creek is generally dry during the summer months along this stretch of the creek. Morrison Creek flows westerly across Sacramento County to Stone Lake. Flow from Stone Lake proceeds southward with eventual discharge to the Sacramento River.

#### **Interim Removal Action**

The interim removal initially consists of a single extraction well, piping from the well to a treatment system, and a

-18-

discharge to the adjacent drainage channel. Additional extraction wells may be added at a later date. The initial extraction rate is estimated to be 600-800 gallons per minute (gpm) and could eventually expand up to 1500 gpm. Groundwater treatment processes include an influent holding tank, a particulate filter, an ion-exchange unit, and discharge piping. The entire system is being constructed on Mather Field under agreements with Sacramento County.

The ion exchange unit will remove perchlorate to less than 4.0  $\mu$ g/l (the quantiation limit) prior to recharge of the treated water. The Department of Health Services Action Level for perchlorate is 4.0  $\mu$ g/l.

Voliatle organic contaminants, primarily TCE, are found in the same formation that will be extracted from for controlling the perchlorate plume. However, due to the large distance between the extraction well and the detectable concentrations of TCE, it is not anticipated that that VOCs will reach the extraction well on the western side of Mather Field during the limited operation of the interim treatment facility. In any case, the site for the treatment plant will have additional space to accommodate treatment components for the removal of VOCs, if needed. The permit calls for monitoring of VOCs and if verified concentrations are detected in the influent to the treatment system, the Boeing Company is required to add appropriate treatment systems to remove the VOCs.

#### Basin Plan, Beneficial Uses, and Regulatory Considerations

Surface water drainage from the WWTF is to the San Joaquin River. The *Water Quality Control Plan for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region, Fourth Edition* (Basin Plan), designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation plans and policies for all waters of the Basin. Beneficial uses often determine the water quality objectives that apply to a water body. For example, waters designated as municipal and domestic supply must meet the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for drinking waters. The Basin Plan sets forth the applicable beneficial uses (industrial, agricultural, and domestic supply in this instance) of groundwater, procedure for application of water quality objectives, and the process for and factors to consider in allocating waste assimilation capacity.

#### Reasonable Potential and Anti-degradation Analyses

A reasonable potential analyses for priority pollutants, utilizing guidance covered by the Policy for the Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (SIP), adopted in March 2000 by the State Board, was conducted based upon data submitted by the Discharger regarding effluent concentrations of volatile organic compounds.

The numeric water quality criteria for priority pollutants were promulgated by U.S. EPA with the adoption of the *National Toxics Rule* on 5 February 1993 and the *California Toxics Rule* on 18 May 2000. The reasonable potential analysis for trichloroethene and perchlorate revealed that these constituents may exceed numeric water quality criteria, and require limits. Limits were not included for those detected constituents where there is no reasonable potential to exceed a standard.

Additionally, federal regulations require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have a reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above numerical or narrative water quality standard. The Discharger is required to provide information as to whether the levels of priority pollutants, including CTR and NTR constituents, and constituents for which drinking water

-19-

maximum contaminant levels prescribed in the California Code of Regulations, in the discharge cause or contribute to an in stream excursion above a water quality objective. If the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality objective, the Discharger is required to submit information to calculate effluent limitations for those constituents.

#### **Effluent Limits**

The following water quality limits have been selected to implement all applicable water quality objectives for the protection of Board-designated beneficial uses of surface water in the Sacramento River downstream of the discharge point.

#### **Perchlorate Limitation**

The current Action Level (January 2002) set by the Department of Health Services -Office of Drinking Water as its recommended value not to be exceeded in a drinking water supply is 4  $\mu$ g/l. In March 2002, the California Department of Health Hazard Assessment released a draft Public Health Goal for perchlorate of 6  $\mu$ g/l. Ion-exchange treatment processes have been shown to be capable of reducing the perchlorate concentration to less than the practical quantitation level of 4  $\mu$ g/l. The effluent limitation is established at 4  $\mu$ g/l based on the ability to reduce the concentration to at or below the Action Level.

#### **Volatile Organic Compounds**

Currently, there are no detectable concentrations of VOCs in the portion of the perchlorate plume that will be captured by the interim extraction and treatment system during its limited term of operation. However, a good distance upgradient of the extraction well, concentrations of TCE are detected within the perchlorate plume. TCE has a Primary Drinking Water Standard of 5  $\mu$ g/l and a Public Health Goal of 0.8  $\mu$ g/l. The initial effluent limitation is set at 0.8  $\mu$ g/l until such time as TCE is detected (>0.5  $\mu$ g/l) in the influent to the treatment system and The Boeing Company is required to provide treatment for the removal of TCE. Once the TCE removal system has been constructed, the effluent limitation drops to 0.5  $\mu$ g/l as conventional TCE removal systems have been shown to be capable to cost-effectively remove TCE to 0.5  $\mu$ g/l. This is below the CTR value of 2.7  $\mu$ g/l.

#### Other

Analysis for metals in samples collected from the groundwater monitoring system and extraction wells and influent to the treatment system were used to assess which metals may be of concern. This analysis found only two metals of concern that were detected, or are currently of potential concern in Morrison Creek. Those metals are copper and copper. The hardness in the groundwater on Mather Field has been measured from 49 mg/l to over 200 mg/l. Total copper and lead have been found up to  $24 \mu g/l$  and  $4 \mu g/l$ , respectively. Those concentrations, utilizing a hardness of 100 mg/l, would exceed their respective CTR values. Given the uncertainty of the copper, lead, and hardness values, the reduction in metals concentrations through the treatment system that utilizes 10-micron filtration, The Boeing Company is provided a time schedule for compliance with establishment of appropriate effluent limitations for copper and lead. The he detected values in the groundwater for those three metals are below the effluent limitations established in this permit.

The following tables provide the rationale for the effluent limits.

-20-

Table 1: Monthly Average Limit

Constituent	Monthly	Units	Reference	
	Average			
	Limit			
Trichloroethene <sup>1</sup>	0.8	μg/l	PHG, Best Practicable Treatment	
Lead	2.5	μg/l	CTR, if hardness is 100 mg/l	
Copper	11	μg/l	CTR, if hardness is 100 mg/l	
Perchlorate	4	μg/l	DHS Action Level, Best Practicable Treatment	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> – Once treatment is required, effluent limit goes to 0.5 μg/l based on Best Practicable Treatment.

Discharge limits are primarily based on the Fourth Edition of the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Central Valley Region, Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins, and Best Available Technology for removal of VOCs and perchlorate.

#### **Receiving Water Limitations**

Receiving Water Limitations D.1 through D.13 are found in the Basin Plan and deal with general receiving water parameters. Given that this is not a discharge of elevated temperature wastewaters, limitations for temperature found in the *Water Quality Control Plan for Control of Temperatures in the Coastal and Interstate Waters and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* are not included.

Chronic toxicity and acute toxicity testing of the effluent is required.

AMM (2/21/02)